



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

full-page plates and over 150 illustrations, mostly half-tone reproductions from photographs of the author's own taking.

An adequate account of the contents of these sections would require much more space than is here allowable, but it may be said in general that Krall is evidently interested in no small measure in the ethical and other general implications of his findings, and it may be safely conjectured that he is more interested in getting results than in submitting them to critical analysis and confirmation. It is significant that though he made more than 12,000 separate tests with Hans, and probably has made many more than that number with his own horses, there are no statistical tables in his book, nor do the extracts from his protocols give any evidence that his experiments were arranged like those of Pfungst to test the effect of the presence or absence of special conditions.

A brief account of the more striking feats of Krall's horses and a summary of his rather unconvincing arguments against Pfungst's first conclusion—the dependence of the horse upon his questioner—will be found in the article upon Hans and the Elberfeld Horses in the body of this number of the *Journal*. It will be sufficient to say here that Krall seems to make out a pretty good case against the control of the horses by unconscious minimal movements serving as visual signals. As the affair now stands science has no certain explanation to offer; nor is it required to offer any explanation in advance of facts which make some one explanation inevitable. Krall has produced a magnificent problem, but, in the reviewer's judgment, no solution of it.

(3.) *Les Chavaux savants d'Elberfeld*, par M. ED. CLAPARÈDE. *Archives de Psychologie*, XII, 1912. 261-304.

(3.) To most psychologists a report of the first-hand observations upon the Elberfeld horses by a psychologist of Claparède's standing will carry great weight. Such a report forms the core of the article before us. Claparède was present at four seances with the horses in August, 1912, and was so far impressed as to place on formal record his conviction (p. 303) that correct answers were given by the horses under conditions which exclude absolutely the hypothesis of voluntary or involuntary signs and his impression that the horses both really counted the taps given and spelled on their own account, though he reserves his decision as to the manner in which they reach so rapidly the results of their mathematical calculations.

What Claparède himself saw concurs in the main—in what might be called the standard performances of the horses—with what is reported by Krall. He describes his general impression as at first unfavorable and even at the end somewhat mixed. When, in reply to a request that the horses be given some very simple problems, he is told that simple problems bore them since they have become accustomed to more complex ones, he is left in much doubt. Why should not the horses be willing, for the sake of the carrots for which they work, to bear a trifle of ennui? But if they were intentionally controlled why should there be hesitation to submit them to simple tests?

In the latter part of his paper Claparède reviews the hypotheses which he regards as possible, five in number: 1, Fraud; 2, Involuntary signals; 3, Telepathy or an unknown sense; 4, True intellectual powers; 5, A combined hypothesis. The first three and the last of

these he rejects, the third and fifth summarily. The fourth he regards as at least logically tenable and makes something of a plea for it, though pointing out that what we need now is facts and rigid experiments.

(4.) *Encore les chevaux d'Elberfeld*, par M. ED. CLAPARÈDE, avec une note de M. le Dr. J. de Modzelewski, Archives de Psychologie, XIII, 1913, 244-284.

(4.) The first section of this second paper of Claparède's on the Elberfeld horses is devoted to the results of a second visit to Krall's stables, in March of the current year, made in company with Drs. Modzelewski and Weber-Bauler of Geneva. Claparède had, with these gentlemen, opportunity to work with the horses both when Krall was absent from the city and when he was present and actively co-operating. The results obtained were entirely negative; that is, the horses failed to respond correctly in most of the tests, the percentage of right cases, according to tables given in Dr. de Modzelewski's note, running only from 7½ to 13%. In the few tests made "without knowledge" there were also no successes.

The general failure of the horses Krall thought might be due to their shedding their coats—"always a trying time for them" (p. 250); but we learn from a letter cited by Claparède (p. 257) that two of the horses very soon after worked well for another visitor, and again on p. 267 we find this note by Krall upon Claparède's first visit: "Prof. Claparède was here some time ago and obtained no results. . . . The day after the departure of M. Claparède, an elderly and very friendly major came to see the horses. He succeeded in becoming the friend of the animals, and they worked without making errors. . . . You see that everything depends on the visitors, especially if they are, or are not, on good terms (*sympathiques*) with the horses." We fear that this is the handwriting on the wall for Prof. Claparède at Elberfeld and indeed for any visitor who cherishes scientific reserves.

The second section of Claparède's paper is devoted to a convenient critical review of recent literature arranged according to the hypotheses favored—trickery, unconscious signals, telepathy, and independent intelligence of the horses. The third section is a counterblast to the "protestation" issued by opponents of Krall's views among German zoologists and comparative psychologists.

The final section is the note of Dr. de Modzelewski in which he favors a telepathic explanation—or, as he prefers to term it, the suggestion of motor inhibition (*suggestion motrice d'inhibition*)—as against the hypotheses of fraud, unconscious signals, and independent intelligence. This, to the reviewer's mind, is not far from saying that the horses are controlled by signals conveyed in a manner not yet determined.

(5.) *I Cavalli pensanti di Elberfeld*, by Dr. WILLIAM MACKENZIE. Da una Conferenza tenuta al VI Congresso della Società Italiana per il Progresso delle Scienze. Genova, Ottobre, 1912. Estratto della Rivista di Psicologia, Anno VIII, n. 6, 1912. Pp. 43.

(5.) In Dr. Mackenzie's presentation of the case for the independent thinking of the Elberfeld horses the reader who has traversed Krall's own volume will find little that is new, save a few paragraphs with reference to the personality of Krall (pp. 9 ff.) and brief descrip-